

Chirality and the Conway polynomial

Department of Mathematics
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN, 37996

Email: jconant@math.utk.edu

Abstract

We conjecture that for the Conway polynomial $C(z)$ of an amphicheiral knot, the product $C(z)C(iz)C(z^2)$ must be a square inside the ring of polynomials with $\mathbb{Z}_4$ coefficients. This conjecture has two ancestors. One is a theorem of Kawauchi and Hartley, which says that the Conway polynomial of a *strongly* amphicheiral knot must decompose as $\phi(z)\phi(-z)$. This implies our main conjecture, at least for strongly amphicheiral knots. The other ancestor is a conjecture, explained herein, in the theory of primitive Goussarov-Vassiliev invariants. It says that the primitive invariants associated to the Conway polynomial in degree $4k$ are congruent modulo 2 to odd invariants in degree $4k-1$. A key ingredient here is a repackaging of the Conway polynomial to better expose its primitive invariants.

AMS Classification numbers Primary: 57M27

Secondary: 57M25

Keywords: Conway polynomial, Goussarov-Vassiliev invariants, amphicheirality

1 Introduction

A knot is said to be amphicheiral if it is isotopic to its mirror image, disregarding string orientation. Knot polynomials like the HOMFLYPT and Kauffman are very good at obstructing amphicheirality, but at first glance, the Conway polynomial seems powerless. After all the Conway polynomial is invariant under taking a mirror image.

The Conway polynomial can be regarded as a homomorphism

$$C: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow 1 + z^2 \cdot \mathbb{Z}[z^2],$$

where $\mathcal{K}$ denotes the monoid of isotopy classes of knots under connected sum, and $\mathbb{Z}[z^2]$ denotes the ring of polynomials in powers of z^2 , with integer coefficients. It is a homomorphism in the sense that it takes connected sum to multiplication.

Conjecture 1.1 *Suppose K is an amphicheiral knot. Then there is a polynomial $F \in \mathbb{Z}_4[z^2]$ such that*

$$F^2 = C(z)C(z^2)C(iz) \in \mathbb{Z}_4[z^2].$$

The conjecture has been tested for all amphicheiral knots with 14 and fewer crossings (Theorem 5.2). If it is a valid test for amphicheirality, it is pretty good. For example, it can detect that the knot 9_{47} fails to be amphicheiral, despite having symmetric HOMFLYPT and Kauffman polynomials. This is because $C(z) = 1 - z^2 + 2z^4 + z^6$, so that $C(z)C(iz)C(z^2) = 1 + 2z^4 + z^8 - z^{24}$ with $\mathbb{Z}_4$ coefficients. To see that this is not a square, we will see that it is sufficient to show that with integer coefficients, it is not the square of a formal power series. Taking the Taylor series of the square root, we get

$$1 + z^4 + 2z^8 - 2z^{12} + 8z^{16} - 2z^{20} - \frac{33}{2}z^{24} + \frac{73}{2}z^{28} + \dots$$

Since this does not have integer coefficients, the polynomial $1 + 2z^4 + z^8 - z^{24}$ cannot be a square.

Another amphicheirality obstruction coming from the Conway polynomial is due to L. Goeritz, R. Hartley and A. Kawauchi [2, 3]. They show that if a knot is amphicheiral, then its determinant is the sum of two squares. The determinant can be calculated by substituting $z^2 = -4$ into $C(z)$. Thus, in a sense their obstruction is orthogonal to the obstruction conjectured here. This is another way to tell that 9_{47} is not amphicheiral.

Moreover, in the paper [3] it is proven that any strongly amphicheiral knot has the property that $C(z) = \phi(z)\phi(-z)$, a fact which implies Conjecture 1.1 for such knots. See Proposition 5.1. Here a strongly amphicheiral knot is a knot which is fixed by an orientation reversing involution of S^3 . I do not know of an example of an amphicheiral knot which is not strongly amphicheiral.

The Conway polynomial is an alternate normalization of the Alexander polynomial, and Conjecture 1.1 can be rephrased accordingly.

Proposition 1.2 *Conjecture 1.1 is equivalent to the following statement. If K is an amphicheiral knot, then $A(t)A(-t)A(t^2)$ is a square inside the ring $\mathbb{Z}_4[t, t^{-1}]$. Here $A(t)$ denotes the Alexander polynomial, normalized so that $A(t) = A(t^{-1})$ and $A(1) = 1$.*

In this paper, we will look at the path which led me to Conjecture 1.1. More specifically, we will identify a conjecture (Conjecture 3.2) in the theory of Goussarov-Vassiliev invariants which will imply Conjecture 1.1. Namely, we conjecture the existence of certain primitive Goussarov-Vassiliev invariants which are congruent modulo 2 to the primitive invariants associated to the Conway polynomial.

A key player in the story solves the following question:

Is the group $1 + x \cdot \mathbb{Z}[[x]]$ of formal power series under multiplication isomorphic to the group $x \cdot \mathbb{Z}[[x]]$ of formal power series under addition?

The answer is yes, and the isomorphism is given by a kind of formal logarithm here dubbed $\log_{\mathbb{Z}}$. This map ought to be useful in other contexts as well, particularly for defining integer-valued primitive Goussarov-Vassiliev invariants from other knot polynomials.

Acknowledgments: I am grateful for many stimulating conversations with (and emails from) Ted Stanford. The present paper is an outgrowth of the author's joint work with him and Jacob Mostovoy. Thanks also to Morwen Thistlethwaite who kindly supplied me with a list of amphicheiral knots with 14 crossings or less, and who made me aware of the work of Kawauchi and Hartley. Finally, thanks to S. Mulay for helping me discover a simpler formula for $\exp_{\mathbb{Z}}$ than the ones I had initially defined. The author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS 0305012.

2 A Formal Logarithm

We begin by defining a formal exponential

$$\exp_{\mathbb{Z}}: x \cdot \mathbb{Z}[[x]] \rightarrow 1 + x \cdot \mathbb{Z}[[x]],$$

where $\exp_{\mathbb{Z}}(F + G) = \exp_{\mathbb{Z}}(F) \cdot \exp_{\mathbb{Z}}(G)$. Namely, let

$$\exp_{\mathbb{Z}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i x^i \right) = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 + (-x)^i)^{a_i}.$$

Evidently $\exp_{\mathbb{Z}}$ takes addition to multiplication.

It is also rather easy to see that $\exp_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a bijection. This follows readily from the fact that

$$\exp_{\mathbb{Z}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i x^i \right) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (a_i + p_i(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1})) x^i,$$

where p_i is a polynomial with integer coefficients.

Now define

$$\log_{\mathbb{Z}}: 1 + x \cdot \mathbb{Z}[[x]] \rightarrow x \cdot \mathbb{Z}[[x]]$$

as the inverse to $\exp_{\mathbb{Z}}$. By construction, it takes multiplication to addition.

Example:

$$\log_{\mathbb{Z}}(1 + x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} -x^{2^i}.$$

This is equivalent to saying that

$$1 + x = \prod_{i=0}^{\infty} (1 + (-x)^{2^i})^{-1},$$

which can be proven using an elementary telescoping argument. $\square$

If we write $\log_{\mathbb{Z}}(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i x^i) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} b_i x^i$, then formulae for the first few b_i are given as follows

$$b_1 = -a_1$$

$$b_2 = a_2 - \frac{1}{2}(a_1 + a_1^2)$$

$$b_3 = -a_3 + a_1 a_2 + \frac{1}{3}(a_1 - a_1^3)$$

$$b_4 = a_4 - a_1 a_3 + \frac{1}{2}(a_2 - a_2^2) + a_1^2 a_2 - \frac{1}{4}(2a_1 + a_1^2 + a_1^4)$$

3 Primitive Goussarov-Vassiliev invariants

The algebra of rational-valued Goussarov-Vassiliev invariants is actually a Hopf algebra, and so by the structure theory of Hopf algebras, it is a polynomial algebra generated by primitive elements. The condition of primitivity amounts to saying that a knot invariant is additive under connected sum. Thus primitive knot invariants play a special role in the theory, although it's not clear whether they polynomially generate all Goussarov-Vassiliev invariants in the case where the invariant's target group is more general.

The coefficients of the Conway polynomial c_{2i} are Goussarov-Vassiliev invariants of degree $2i$, but they are not primitive. By applying $\log_{\mathbb{Z}}$ to $C(z^2)$ (regarding z^2 as the variable) we get an additive invariant of knots taking values in $\mathbb{Z}[[z^2]]$, and it is easy to show that the coefficients, denoted pc_{2i} , are primitive Vassiliev invariants of degree $2i$.

The following theorem is proven in [1].

Theorem 3.1 *pc_{2i} is a degree $2i$ Goussarov-Vassiliev invariant over $\mathbb{Z}$, and is of degree $2i - 1$ over $\mathbb{Z}_2$.*

In that paper we deduce the consequence that the only primitive Goussarov-Vassiliev invariants of S -equivalence come from the invariants pc_{2i} . (Two knots are S -equivalent if they have isomorphic Alexander modules and Blanchfield forms. Alternatively, if there exist Seifert surfaces with isomorphic Seifert pairings.)

Theorem 3.1 opens the door for us, because it suggests that there may be an integer-valued degree $2i - 1$ invariant v_{2i-1} which is a lift of pc_{2i} modulo 2. There isn't enough evidence to conjecture that all of these pc_{2i} lift, however, there is some evidence to support the following.

Conjecture 3.2 *There exist integer-valued Goussarov-Vassiliev invariants, v_{4i-1} , of degree $4i - 1$, such that*

$$pc_{4i} \equiv v_{4i-1} \pmod{2}.$$

Something that often happens is that odd-degree invariants are odd. That is, they change sign under mirror image, and therefore vanish on amphicheiral knots. (Conceivably string orientation might be a factor, but no known Goussarov-Vassiliev invariant can detect string orientation. Moreover the fact that the amphicheirality criterion we ultimately derive works for $+/-$ amphicheiral knots

suggests that the invariants v_{4i-1} , if they exist, are probably insensitive to string orientation.)

Therefore, if v_{4i-1} were indeed an odd invariant, then pc_{4i-1} would have to be even on any amphicheiral knot, a possibility which has computer evidence to support it.

Conjecture 3.3 *The invariants v_{4i-1} of Conjecture 3.2 can be chosen to be odd.*

This conjecture is a fact proven by Ted Stanford when $i = 1$ [5], where it is shown that a degree 3 odd invariant, v_3 , is congruent, modulo 2, to $\frac{1}{2}(c_2 + c_2^2) + c_4$. Indeed, we may take $v_3 = -\frac{1}{12}J''(1) - \frac{1}{36}J'''(1)$, where $J(t)$ is the Jones polynomial.

Corollary 3.4 *If Conjecture 3.3 holds, then $pc_{4i} \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ on amphicheiral knots.*

This gives us a sequence of amphicheirality criteria. We list the first three in terms of the standard coefficients of the Conway polynomial.

$$c_4 + \frac{1}{2}(c_2^2 + c_2) \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \quad (\text{Stanford's Criterion})$$

$$c_8 + c_2(c_6 + c_4) + \frac{1}{2}(c_4^2 - c_4) + \frac{1}{4}(c_2^4 + c_2^2 + 2c_2) \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$$

$$c_{12} + c_2(c_{10} + c_4 + c_6 + c_8) + c_4c_8 + \frac{1}{2}(c_6^2 + c_6) + \frac{1}{2}(c_2c_4 - 3(c_2c_4)^2) \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$$

4 A conjecture without a formal log

Conjecture 3.1 is certainly intriguing and the amphicheirality criterion of Corollary 3.4 can be easily tested with the aid of a computer mathematics package. However, it turns out that the criterion can be reformulated without reference to $\log_{\mathbb{Z}}$. This is shown in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1 *Let*

$$f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 + (-x)^i)^{a_i}.$$

Then $f(x)f(-x)f(x^2) \in (1 + x \cdot \mathbb{Z}[[x]])^2$ if and only if for all i , $a_{2i} \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$.

Proof Let $\alpha, \beta \in 1+x\mathbb{Z}[[x]]$. Write $\alpha \sim \beta$ if $\alpha = \beta\gamma^2$, for some $\gamma \in 1+x\mathbb{Z}[[x]]$. In words, α is equivalent modulo squares to β .

Suppose $f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1+x^i)^{a_i}$ satisfies $a_{2i} \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ for all i . Then we wish to show that $f(x)f(-x)f(x^2)$ is a square inside $1+x\mathbb{Z}[[x]]$. Then $f(x)$ is equivalent modulo squares to $\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1-x^{2i-1})^{a_{2i-1}}$. Now

$$f(x)f(-x)f(x^2) \sim \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1-x^{2i-1})^{a_{2i-1}} (1+x^{2i-1})^{a_{2i-1}} (1+x^{4i-2})^{a_{2i-1}},$$

which is a product of squares.

For the converse, note that the previous argument shows that

$$\begin{aligned} f(x)f(-x)f(x^2) &\sim \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1+x^{2i})^{a_{2i}} (1+x^{2i})^{a_{2i}} (1+x^{4i})^{a_{2i}} \\ &\sim \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1+x^{4i})^{a_{2i}} \end{aligned}$$

Suppose, toward a contradiction that not all of the a_{2i} are even. Let i_0 be the minimal index such that a_{2i_0} is odd. Then modulo squares,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x)f(-x)f(x^2) &\sim \prod_{i=i_0}^{\infty} (1+x^{4i})^{a_{2i}} \\ &= 1 + a_{2i_0}x^{4i_0} + \dots \end{aligned}$$

Since the coefficient of the smallest power of x must be even in a perfect square, we deduce that a_{2i_0} is even, a contradiction. $\square$

The next two propositions allow us to deduce Conjecture 1.1 from Conjecture 3.3 and Theorem 4.1.

Proposition 4.2 Suppose $F, G \in 1+x\mathbb{Z}[[x]]$, and the coefficients of F are congruent to the coefficients of G modulo 4. If $\sqrt{F} \in 1+x\mathbb{Z}[[x]]$, then $\sqrt{G} \in 1+x\mathbb{Z}[[x]]$.

Proof Assume that $G = F \pm 4x^i$. This will imply the general case. I claim that $\sqrt{G/F} \in 1+x\mathbb{Z}[[x]]$ in which case we're done, since $\sqrt{G} = \sqrt{G/F}\sqrt{F}$. Letting $\gamma = \pm x^i/F$, we have that

$$\sqrt{G/F} = \sqrt{1+4\gamma}$$

It is now an exercise in Taylor series to show that $\sqrt{1+4\gamma}$ has integer coefficients. $\square$

Proposition 4.3 *Let F be a formal power series in $\mathbb{Z}_4[[x]]$. Suppose $F^2 \in \mathbb{Z}_4[x]$. That is, the square is a polynomial. Then either $F \in \mathbb{Z}_4[x]$ or $F = F_1 + 2F_2$ where F_1 is a polynomial.*

Proof Suppose otherwise. Then F has coefficients of ± 1 of arbitrarily high degree. Consider $\bar{F} \in \mathbb{Z}_2[[x]]$. Then $\bar{F} = \sum_{i \in I} z^i$, where $|I|$ is infinite. Now $\bar{F}^2 = \sum_{i \in I} z^{2i}$ which is not a polynomial, indicating that F^2 is also not a polynomial. $\square$

Proposition 4.4 *Conjecture 1.1 is equivalent to the criterion of Corollary 3.4.*

Proof Suppose $pc_{4i} \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ for all i . According to Theorem 4.1, this is equivalent to $C(z)C(iz)C(z^2)$ being the square of a formal power series with integer coefficients. By Proposition 4.2, this is equivalent to the corresponding statement with $\mathbb{Z}_4$ coefficients. Now, if $C(z)C(z^2)C(iz) = F^2$ inside $\mathbb{Z}_4[[z]]$, then we know $F = F_1 + 2F_2$ by Proposition 4.3, where F_1 is a polynomial. But then $C(z)C(z^2)C(iz) = F_1^2$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 1.2 It is straightforward to see that the polynomials correspond (with $\mathbb{Z}_4$ coefficients) according to the rule

$$z^{2n} = t^{-n} + t^n + 2.$$

Thus $C(z)C(iz)C(z^2)$ maps to $A(t)A(-t)A(t^2)$. So if the former were a square, so would be the latter. On the other hand, starting with $A(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N a_i(t^i + t^{-i}) + a_0$, we can see that $A(t)A(-t)A(t^2)$ maps to $C(z)C(iz)C(z^2)$. $\square$

5 The work of Hartley and Kawauchi

A knot is said to be strongly positive (or negative) amphicheiral if there is an orientation reversing involution of S^3 which fixes the knot set-wise, and whose restriction to the knot preserves string orientation or reverses it.

Hartley and Kawauchi show that if a knot is strongly negative amphicheiral, then its Alexander polynomial can be written $f(\sqrt{t})f(-\sqrt{t})$ for some integral polynomial $f(\sqrt{t})$ satisfying $f(-\sqrt{t}) = f(1/\sqrt{t})$ and $|f(1)| = 1$. This can be rephrased as the fact that the Conway polynomial factors as $C(z) = \phi(z)\phi(-z)$, where ϕ is an integer polynomial.

Similarly, they show (see also [4]) that if a knot is strongly positive amphicheiral, then its Alexander polynomial can be written $f(t)^2$ for some integral polynomial

$f(t)$ satisfying $f(t) = f(t^{-1})$ and $|f(1)| = 1$. This can be rephrased as the fact that the Conway polynomial factors as $C(z) = \psi(z^2)^2$ for an integer polynomial ψ . In particular, the Conway polynomial is of the form $\phi(z)\phi(-z)$.

Proposition 5.1 *If $C(z) = \phi(z)\phi(-z)$ for an integer polynomial ϕ , then $C(z)C(iz)C(z^2)$ is the square of an integer power series. Hence Conjecture 1.1 holds for all strongly amphicheiral knots.*

Proof Write $C(z) = \phi(z)\phi(-z)$. Either $\phi(0) = 1$ or $\phi(0) = -1$. If the latter, replace ϕ by $-\phi$. Now $\phi(z) = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 + (-z)^i)^{a_i}$. So, modulo squares, $\phi(z)\phi(-z) = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 - z^{2i-1})^{a_{2i-1}}$. On the other hand $C(iz)$ is modulo squares the product of terms of the form $(1 + z^{2i-1})^{a_{2i-1}}$, and $C(z^2)$ is modulo squares a product of terms of the form $(1 - z^{4i-2})^{a_{2i-1}}$, from which the desired result follows easily. $\square$

The condition that $C(z) = \phi(z)\phi(-z)$ is strictly stronger than that of Conjecture 1.1, even if one assumes the determinant is a sum of two squares. For example $C(z) = 1 - 76z^2$ is congruent to 1 modulo 4, so it satisfies the criterion of Conjecture 1.1, and $\det = C(2i) = 305 = 4^2 + 17^2$. However $C(z) \neq \phi(z)\phi(-z)$ since the absolute value of the coefficient of the highest power of z is not a square. If one could find an amphicheiral knot with $C(z) = 1 - 76z^2$ then it would not be strongly amphicheiral.

We conclude by verifying the hypothesis of Proposition 5.1 on the first several hundred amphicheiral knots.

Theorem 5.2 *Every prime amphicheiral knot with 14 or fewer crossings has Conway polynomial of the form $C(z) = \phi(z)\phi(-z)$ for integer polynomials $\phi(z)$. Hence Conjecture 1.1 holds for all such knots.*

Proof This theorem was established by feeding a list of all such prime knots provided by M. Thistlethwaite into a program written for a computer mathematics package. The program factorizes the Conway polynomial, then divides the polynomial by some factor $\alpha(z)$ and also by $\alpha(-z)$. If the result is still a polynomial, it repeats the procedure. If the process finally terminates in the polynomial “1,” then the program declares the polynomial “good,” and moves on to the next knot. $\square$

References

- [1] **J Conant**, **J Mostovoy** and **T Stanford**, in preparation.
- [2] **L Goeritz** *Knoten und quadratische formen*, Math. Z., 36 (1933) 647-654
- [3] **R Hartley** and **A Kawauchi**, *Polynomials of amphicheiral knots*, Math Annalen, **243** (1979) No.1, 63–70
- [4] **J Lieberum**, *Skein modules of links in cylinders over surfaces*, Int. J. Math. Sci., **32**, (2002), no. 9, 515-554
- [5] **T Stanford** *Some computational results on mod 2 finite type invariants of knots and string links*, Geometry and Topology Monographs Vol. 4 (2002), Invariants of knots and 3-manifolds (Kyoto 2001), Paper no. 23, p. 363–376